



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

agency or treatment, and that such a practice was the practice of medicine within the plain meaning of the statute defining the "practice of medicine."

Deceptive Imitation of Telegram for Advertising Purposes.—Defendant, a manufacturer of advertising specialties, put out an envelope similar to those used by complainant telegraph company for telegrams, intending that the envelopes should be used for advertising purposes, the word "Telegram," printed thereon, being used to attract attention and to distinguish the envelopes, which were to be sent through the mail, from ordinary mail matter. Complainant sued to restrain such use, alleging that the envelopes were used to deceive the public and cause them to believe that they were the envelopes of the complainant, and that they contained messages transmitted over complainant's wires and delivered by complainant; that defendant's envelopes had been generally mistaken by the public, by the postal authorities, and especially by complainant's patrons, for the envelopes of the complainant, and had induced the public and complainant's patrons to give to the envelopes that prompt and immediate attention which was usually given to telegraphic messages; and that the same would cause annoyance to complainant's patrons and an injury to complainant's business. The United States Circuit Court, in *Postal Telegraph-Cable Co. v. Livermore & Knight Co.*, 188 Federal Reporter, 696, holds that since the deception, if the use of such envelopes were deceptive at all, was merely momentary and not deceitful, complainant's claim of injury was derived entirely from inferences based on another inference, and that the facts were insufficient to establish actionable injury.

The Workman's Compensation Act Held Constitutional.—The Industrial Insurance Law, commonly known as "The Workman's Compensation Act," has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court of Washington in *State v. Clausen*, 117 Pacific Reporter, 1101. This act, which undertakes, by requiring contributions from employers to an accident or insurance fund, to provide fixed and certain relief for workmen injured in extra-hazardous work and for families and dependents regardless of questions of fault or negligence, to the exclusion of every other remedy or compensation, and which among other things, provides that no employer shall exempt himself from the burden or waive the benefits of the act by any contract, agreement, or regulation, and that any such contract or regulation shall be pro tanto void, is held not an interference with the right to contract, since there is no absolute right to do as one wills, pursue any calling one desires, or contract as one chooses, and since the term "liberty" means absence of arbitrary restraint, and not immunity from reasonable regulations and provisions imposed in the interests

of the community. The court also held that it does not violate the constitutional provision which prohibits class legislation, is not objectionable as a denial to owners of property equal protection of the laws, and is not a violation of the constitutional provision that property shall be taxed according to its value in money, and that all taxation shall be equal and uniform.

MISCELLANY.

The Right of Asylum.—The admitted and generally recognized principles of international law have not altered the meaning or the effect of the right of asylum, that sovereign right possessed alike by civilized and uncivilized countries. The word asylum still retains its old signification of a place of safety from pursuit, and a protection to all who come within its borders. The territory of a foreign country is an asylum for refugees, political or other, but it is of course subject to the law and treaties of extradition, and to the right of expulsion, the latter, by the almost universal comity of nations, being in many cases an inherent, and in others a reserved, right which all nations claim per se as their own. The right of asylum is a necessary consequence of the inviolability of neutral territory, and we find in Latin and Greek history instances where the right was claimed and acknowledged. It is also used in international law as what, for want of a better word, may be described as the cover extended by neutral territory to belligerent fugitives.

The practice of different countries is as a rule uniform, the only difference arising when land forces as distinguished from naval forces are concerned. For example, in the former case, a neutral state may at all times receive individuals belonging to the states that are at war with each other, and even the forces thereof, provided its position as a neutral be recognized. Hostilities on that territory cannot be resumed, and the custom is to disarm the refugee forces. In the latter case, a belligerent war vessel may undergo repair and take in such coal and provisions as she needs in a neutral port, and the latter, in not actively preventing the vessel from resuming fighting operations, does not contravene the generally accepted law of nations.

The right of asylum is an apt illustration of the rule of international law that a state is at liberty to do whatever it likes within the confines of its own territory, regardless of the opinions or wishes of other states, so long as its acts do not operate injuriously or prejudicially to their interests and rights.

The cloak of asylum equally covers emigrants and refugees and whether or not the former have broken the laws of their own coun-